


### **Amendments to the Drawings**

A replacement sheet of drawings including changes to Figure 6 is attached and an annotated copy of Figure 6 identifying changes made is included below. Specifically, Figure 6 has been amended to indicate the location of the pivot block projection 52 within the bore 50. Support for the amendments is found in the originally filed application. No new matter has been added. The Applicant believes that the objections to the drawings and the specification are now moot. Applicant respectfully requests that objections to the specification and drawings be withdrawn.

### **Annotated Marked-Up Drawing**



### REMARKS

Claims 12-14 and 18-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,645,259 ("Chen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,935 ("Talesky"). Similarly, Claims 12-14 and 18-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talesky in view of Chen. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Neither Chen nor Talesky, nor the combination of the two, teach or suggest all the claim limitations of independent claim 12. For example, as the Examiner acknowledges, Chen does not disclose a "bench top power tool" nor does it disclose a first or second series of "attachment configurations."

Talesky does not provide the missing elements. For example, Talesky does not disclose a "first series of attachment configurations formed *about* a peripheral edge" of the bench top power tool. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the tabs 20 as disclosed in Talesky are first attachment configurations, they are simply not formed *about* a peripheral edge of the bench top power tool. Rather, they are formed merely along a single peripheral leg of the power tool periphery.

Similarly, Talesky does not disclose a second series of attachment configurations. Because Talesky fails to disclose first attachment configurations according to claim 12, Talesky necessarily cannot disclose second attachment configurations for receiving them.

Finally, Talesky does not disclose "cross members ... pivotally connected to the second series of attachment configurations." Assuming for the sake of argument that the tabs 20 constitute first attachment configurations, then the only corresponding

structure that Talesky discloses for receiving the tabs 20 are the inner slots 39. Talesky does not disclose any structure that can be construed as a cross member that is connected, pivotally or otherwise, to the inner slots 39.

In order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must provide references that teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. The Examiner has not provided sufficient references. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 12-14 and 18-19.

As for the rejection of claims 20-27, Applicant notes that the Examiner acknowledges that Chen does not disclose a portable table saw or a saw base, nor does it disclose a series of pivot blocks or a series of saw base bores as required by claim 20. Chen also does not disclose a series of links wherein "the lower ends of the links define feet for supporting the stand and the saw base." Instead, Chen discloses a series of links 25, each having a lower end pivoted to a lower positioning seat 23. The lower positioning seat 23 is attached to a *supporting* leg 21A, 21B. (Column 3, Line 51-58). The links 25 do not define *supporting feet* as required by claim 20. Further, none of the legs 21A and 21B can be properly considered to be links because they are not pivotally connected to one another.

Talesky does not provide any of the missing elements. The Examiner acknowledges that neither Talesky nor the combination with Chen discloses a series of pivot block projections on the stand. Further, the Examiner acknowledges that neither of the cited patents, nor their combination discloses a series of saw base bores. Therefore, it is clear that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Examiner, however, argues that Talesky broadly discloses a series of pivot block projections on the saw base and a series of bores in the stand. Defined as such, the Examiner argues that the present invention is merely a "reversal of parts."

The Examiner is mistaken. This argument completely ignores the clear and unambiguous language of claim 20. Claim 20 states that "each pivot block is pivotally connected to a pair of sequential link first ends." Assuming for the sake of argument that the tabs 20 constitute pivot blocks and the slots 39 constitute bores, reversing the two does not result in the claimed structure because neither the slots nor the bores are connected to any structure even resembling a link as required.

The Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Because neither cited reference discloses every element of claim 20, independently or in combination, the Examiner has not met this burden. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 20-27.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. If, for any reason, the Examiner feels that the above amendments and remarks do not put the claims in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney can be reached at (312) 321-4276 to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



---

G. Peter Nichols  
Registration No. 34,401

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200